REMARKS

The comments of the applicant below are each preceded by related comments of the examiner (in small, bold type).

> **2. Claim 15 is objected to because of the following informalities:**
> **Re claim *15*, line 1: substitute "claim 6" with --claim 8--.**
> **Claim 6 which depends on claim 1 recites a method claim, and claim 8 is an apparatus claim. It appears that claim 15 should have depended on claim 8.**
> **Appropriate correction/clarification is required.**

Claim 15 has been amended.

> **4. Claims 1-21, 23, 24, 26-31, and 33-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Graef et al. (US 4,664,369, hereinafter "Graef', cited by Applicant).**
> **Re claims 1-4, 8-12, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 24, 30, 31, and 33-38, Graef teaches a thickness indicator apparatus used in Automated Teller Machine (ATM) (see abstract; col. 2, lines 27+) for detecting double bills when the bills are retrieved from the stack (col. 1, lines 34+; col. 3, lines 58+; col. 6, lines 4+).. The thickness detector is comprised of two elongated fingers 50 (or free ends) attached to a wishbone 45 (col. 4, lines 16+; see figure 3). When bills move between the plate 42 and the elongated fingers 50, the elongated fingers are displaced/pushed by the thickness of the bill (col. 4, line 51 - col. 5, line 37). Re claim 5, the bill moving path further comprised of a roller 12 and a counter rotating roller 36 (col. 3, lines 36+; col. 3, lines 60+).**

Claim 1 has been amended to recite "the amount by which the free end [of the finger] is moved being determined by measuring relative rotation of two inductively coupled elements." (emphasis added)

In Graef, by contrast, the "[p]roximity sensor acts as a signal generating means and is preferably the type which generates a voltage signal proportional to the distance of the plane of the face of the metallic target 52 from the sensor ..." (column 4, lines 40-44, emphasis added). Graef does not describe or suggest measuring relative rotation of two inductively coupled elements.

Claims 8, 17, and 18 all recite "relative rotation" and are patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 30 recites "a molded linear path having a flat supporting surface for currency being driven from a money box at one end of the path to a dispensing location at the other end of the path, a pattern of static electricity grounding elements arranged along the path, and coupling features configured to enable mounting of the path between two side walls of a housing of a currency dispenser." In some examples, using a pattern of static electricity grounding elements arranged along the path reduces static electricity that may cause bills to cling to the parts of the dispenser or to each other. The cited portions of Graef neither disclose nor would have suggested a molded linear path, a pattern of static electricity grounding elements arranged along the path, and coupling features configure to enable mounting of the path.

Claim 35 recites "causing the currency to be routed by default to the retention location in the absence of a determination that a flaw is not present." Although Graef describes "a device which retrieves the bills .. rather than allowing them to be presented to the customer" (column 8, lines 37-42), Graef suggests that the bills are diverted only "upon failing to make the bill identifiable after a preset number of attempts" and not by default (column 8, lines 34-37). Furthermore, in column 7, lines 11-13, Graef describes pulling flawed bills back into the dispenser, not routing them by default to a retention location, "any multiple or skewed bills can be pulled back into stack 20 by reversing the rotation of roller 12 ... This process of reversing the rotation of roller 12 causes a 'scrubbing' action which tends to separate multiple bills and square the direction of travel of single bills ..."

Re claim 6 ...

Re claims 7, 13, 15, and 16 ...

Re claim 14 ...

These claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as the claims on which they depend.

Re claims 19 and 26-29, as shown in figure 3, the apparatus is comprised of a housing/frame 15 which houses a bill thickness detecting component (see figure 3; col. 3, lines 36+).

Though Graef mentions that "picker 10 is enclosed in a frame.." and that "shaft 14 is mounted in frame 15.." (column 3, lines 40 and 41), the cited portions of Graef neither disclose

nor would have suggested a "housing comprising at least two parallel spaced-apart molded side walls," or a "paper path comprising a molded wall or walls between the two parallel molded side walls," as recited in claim 19. In some examples, the molding is of plastic material which makes the currency dispenser strong, lightweight, and easy to assemble.

Claim 26 recites "using fasteners to assemble .. a housing of a currency dispenser, attaching plastic bearings to the two side walls to mount currency drive shafts .. , and attaching a double-detect mechanism on the paper path. Although in column 3, lines 41 and 42, Graef describes mounting a shaft "in a frame 15 between bearing means 17," Graef's bearing means are neither described as nor suggested to be plastic bearings. In some instances, using plastic bearings and fasteners enables rapid and therefore inexpensive assembly, among other things.

Claims 20, 21, 23, 24, and 27-29 are patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 19.

6. Claims 22, 25, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Graef et al. (US 4,664,369).
Although Graef does not explicitly suggests the details of the housing as they are recited in the above-mentioned claims (snap-in bearings and grounding elements comprising braided wire and metal lugs), it is the Examiner's view that Graef shows a box-type of housing which is substantially the same housing Applicant claims. Perhaps the component parts for building such housing may be different, but it is the Examiner's view that more substantial elements — thickness (or double bills) detection utilizing elongated fingers are disclosed by Graef. The differences in constructing housing may not patentable unless Applicant particularly points out patentabilities of the housing.

Graef does not describe and would not have suggested plastic "snap-in" bearings, nor using plastic snap-in bearings with molded walls in a currency dispenser as recited in claim 25. In some examples, the combination of the plastic snap-in bearings and molded walls enables rapid and therefore inexpensive assembly, among other things.

Claims 22 and 32 are patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 19.

All of the dependent claims are patentable for at least the reasons for which the claims on which they depend are patentable.

Canceled claims, if any, have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Any circumstance in which the applicant has (a) addressed certain comments of the examiner does not mean that the applicant concedes other comments of the examiner, (b) made arguments for the patentability of some claims does not mean that there are not other good reasons for patentability of those claims and other claims, or (c) amended a claim does not mean that the applicant concedes any of the examiner's positions with respect to that claim or other claims.

Enclosed is a $225.00 check for the Petition for Extension of Time fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050, reference 13543-003001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 3/10/5

David L. Feigenbaum
Reg. No. 30,378

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110-2804
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906
21028839.doc